A/CONF.199/4

United Nations

Report of the Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee for the World Summit on Sustainable Development

Fourth session
(27 May-7 June 2002)

Report of the Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee for the World Summit on Sustainable Development

Fourth session (27 May-7 June 2002)

United Nations • New York, 2002

Note

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Contents

Chapter		Paragraphs	Page
I.	Introduction	1	1
II.	Organization of the session	2–38	1
	A. Opening and duration of the session	2–8	1
	B. Attendance	9–18	1
	C. Officers of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee	19–20	3
	D. Agenda and organization of work	21–22	3
	E. Accreditation of intergovernmental organizations as observers to the preparatory process and the World Summit on Sustainable Development	23	3
	F. Accreditation of non-governmental organizations as observers to the preparatory process and the Summit	24–37	3
	G. Documentation	38	5
III.	Multi-stakeholder dialogue segment	39–59	5
IV.	High-level ministerial segment	60–87	7
V.	Draft plan of implementation for the Summit	88–93	8
VI.	Elaboration of possible elements for a political document to be submitted for consideration and adoption by heads of State or Government at the Summit	94	9
VII.	Matters related to the organization of the work of the Summit	95–97	10
VIII.	Expression of thanks to the people and Government of Indonesia	98	10
IX.	Adoption of the report	99	10
X.	Decisions adopted by the Commission acting as the preparatory committee	100	10
	2002/PC/4. Draft plan of implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development		10
	2002/PC/5. Elaboration of possible elements for a political document to be submitted for consideration and adoption by heads of State or Government at the World Summit on Sustainable Development		10
	2002/PC/6. Matters relating to the organization of the work of the World Summit on Sustainable Development		10
	2002/PC/7. Expression of thanks to the people and Government of Indonesia		12

Annexes

I. Chairman's summary of the high-level ministerial segment 13

II. Chairman's summary of the multi-stakeholders dialogue segment 18

III. Vice-Chairpersons' summary of informal meetings on partnerships for sustainable development 32

IV. List of documents before the Commission acting as the preparatory committee at its fourth session 36

Chapter I
Introduction

1. By its resolution 55/199, the General Assembly decided to convene the Commission on Sustainable Development to act as the preparatory committee for the World Summit on Sustainable Development. The Commission acting as the preparatory committee held its first (organizational), second and third sessions at United Nations Headquarters from 30 April to 2 May 2001, 28 January to 8 February 2002 and 25 March to 5 April 2002, respectively. In accordance with paragraph 18 of the same resolution, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee held its fourth and final session in Bali, Indonesia, from 27 May to 7 June 2002.

Chapter II
Organization of the session

A. Opening and duration of the session

2. The Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee held its fourth session from 27 May to 7 June 2002, as recommended in its decision 2001/PC/1. It held 12 meetings (1st to 12th), meetings of the working groups and a number of informal meetings.

Opening statements

3. At the 1st meeting, on 27 May, the Chairman of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee, Emil Salim (Indonesia), made an opening statement.

4. The State Minister of the Environment of Indonesia, Nabiel Makarim, gave a welcoming address.

5. The Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat and Secretary-General of the Summit made an introductory statement.

Other presentations

6. At the 1st meeting, on 27 May, Hans Hoogeveen, Director, Ministry for Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries of the Netherlands, presented the outcome of the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, on behalf of Geke Faber (Netherlands), President of the Conference of the Parties.

7. At the same meeting, Tu'ioma Neroni Slade (Samoa), Co-Chairman of the United Nations open-ended informal consultative process on ocean affairs, established by the General Assembly in its resolution 54/33, presented the results of the third meeting of the process.

8. At the 3rd meeting, on 29 May, the Prince of Orange of the Netherlands addressed the Commission acting as the preparatory committee in his capacity as a member of the Secretary-General's Panel of Eminent Persons on the issue of water.

B. Attendance

9. In accordance with paragraph 13 of General Assembly resolution 55/199, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee was open-ended to allow for the full participation of all States.

10. The following States were represented: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru,

Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

11. The European Community was represented.

12. The following entity having received a standing invitation to participate as observer in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly was represented: Palestine.

13. The following United Nations organs and programmes were represented: Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA), International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), United Nations Institute for Training and Research, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations University, United Nations Volunteers, World Food Programme.

14. The following specialized agencies were represented: International Labour Organization (ILO), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), World Health Organization (WHO), the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, World Meteorological Organization (WMO), International Maritime Organization, World Intellectual Property Organization, International Fund for Agricultural Development, United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), International Atomic Energy Agency, World Trade Organization.

15. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented by observers: Asia-Africa Legal Consultative Committee, Asian Development Bank, Association of South-East Asian Nations, Baltic 21 (Agenda 21 for the Baltic Sea Region), Caribbean Community (CARICOM), Center for International Forestry Research, Common Fund for Commodities, Commonwealth of Independent States, Commonwealth Secretariat, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, Convention on Wetlands, European Space Agency (ESA), Global Environment Facility, International Energy Agency, International Organization of la Francophonie, International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), Nordic Council of Ministers, North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation, North South Centre of the Council of Europe, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, Pacific Centre for Environment and Sustainable Development, Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden.

16. The observers for the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, entities having received a standing invitation to participate as observers in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly and maintaining permanent offices at Headquarters, attended the session.

17. The following convention secretariats attended the session: Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Convention on Biological Diversity.

18. A large number of non-governmental organizations attended the session.

C. Officers of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee

19. The Officers of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee were elected at its first session and remained as follows:

Chairman:
Emil Salim (Indonesia)

Vice-Chairpersons:
Maria Luiza Ribeiro Viotti (Brazil)
Richard Ballhorn (Canada)
Jan Kára (Czech Republic)
Ihab Gamaleldin (Egypt)
Diane Marie Quarless (Jamaica)
Kyotaka Akasaka (Japan)
Ositadinma Anaedu (Nigeria)
Alexandru Niculescu (Romania)
Lars-Göran Engfeldt (Sweden)

20. The Commission acting as the preparatory committee agreed that Diane Marie Quarless (Jamaica), Vice-Chairperson, would also serve as Rapporteur.

D. Agenda and organization of work

21. At its 1st meeting, on 27 May, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee adopted its provisional agenda as contained in document A/CONF.199/PC/15. The agenda was as follows:

1. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters.
2. Consideration of the revised Chairman's paper transmitted from the third session of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee, together with other relevant inputs to the preparatory process.
3. Elaboration of possible elements for a political document to be submitted for consideration and adoption by heads of State or Government.
4. Multi-stakeholder dialogue segment.
5. Organization of the work of the Summit.
6. Other matters.
7. Adoption of the report of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee on its fourth session.

22. At the same meeting, the Chairman reminded the Commission acting as the preparatory committee of the following arrangements regarding the distribution of tasks among the Vice-Chairpersons: Co-Chairs of Working Group I: Kyotaka Akasaka (Japan), Maria Luiza Viotti (Brazil); Co-Chairs of Working Group II: Richard Ballhorn (Canada), Ihab Gamaleldin (Egypt); Co-Chairs of Working Group III: Lars-Göran Engfeldt (Sweden), Ositadinma Anaedu (Nigeria). Vice-Chairpersons Jan Kára (Czech Republic) and Diane Marie Quarless (Jamaica) acted as facilitators for type two initiatives.

E. Accreditation of intergovernmental organizations as observers to the preparatory process and the World Summit on Sustainable Development

23. At its 1st and 4th meetings, on 27 and 31 May, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee approved the accreditation of the following intergovernmental organizations as observers: Asian Development Bank, Baltic 21 (Agenda 21 for the Baltic Sea Region), Center for International Forestry Research, Commission on Science and Technology for Sustainable Development in the South, Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe, Global Biodiversity Information Facility, International Joint Commission, International Parliamentary Union, North South Centre of the Council of Europe, Pacific Centre for Environment and Sustainable Development, South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme, South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission, OPEC Fund for International Development.

F. Accreditation of non-governmental organizations as observers to the preparatory process and the Summit

24. At its 1st meeting, on 27 May, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee approved the accreditation of a number of non-governmental organizations and other major groups to participate as observers in the preparatory process and the Summit, as contained in annex I to document A/CONF.199/PC/20, with the exception of the World Sindhi Institute.

World Sindhi Institute

25. At the same meeting, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee decided that the decision on the request for accreditation by the World Sindhi Institute should be in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, which was currently considering its application for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.

Movement of Reconstruction and Development

26. Also at the same meeting, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee decided not to accredit the Movement of Reconstruction and Development (see A/CONF.199/PC/20) due to lack of relevant information.

Body Shop International

27. At the same meeting, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee decided to remove Body Shop International from the list of accredited non-governmental organizations and other major groups in view of the fact that it had already been accredited as the Body Shop Foundation.

3663 Food First

28. Also at the same meeting, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee was informed that 3663 Food First had withdrawn its application for accreditation and should therefore be removed from the list.

Solar Energy Systems

29. At the same meeting, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee decided to remove Solar Energy Systems from the list of accredited non-governmental organizations and other major groups, in view of the fact that it had not responded to enquiries regarding its status and had not registered to participate in the fourth session.

Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy

30. At its 4th meeting, on 31 May, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee considered the request by the Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy for accreditation to participate in the work of the preparatory process and the Summit (see A/CONF.199/PC/20, annex II).

31. At the same meeting, the attention of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee was drawn to a letter dated 14 May 2002 from the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (A/CONF.199/PC/19), objecting to the accreditation of the Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy.

32. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America proposed that the request for accreditation by the Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy be approved.

33. At the same meeting, the representative of Spain (on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the European Union, as well as the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta and Poland) made a statement in support of the proposal made by the United States.

34. Also at the same meeting, the representative of China put forward a motion to take no action on the request for accreditation by the Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy, and requested that a roll-call vote be conducted in that regard.

35. At the same meeting, statements in favour of the motion put forward by China were made by the representatives of Pakistan and Cuba.

36. Also at the same meeting, statements against the motion put forward by China were made by the representatives of the United States of America and Spain (on behalf of the European Union, as well as the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta and Poland).

37. At the same meeting, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee carried the motion for no action by a roll-call vote of 90 to 37, with 10 abstentions. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic

Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Chad, Guatemala, Holy See, India, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal.

G. Documentation

38. The list of documents before the Commission acting as the preparatory committee is contained in the annex.

Chapter III
Multi-stakeholder dialogue segment

39. The Commission acting as the preparatory committee held a multi-stakeholder dialogue at its 2nd and 3rd meetings, on 27 and 29 May 2002. It had before it a note by the Secretary-General (A/CONF.199/PC/18 and Add.1-9).

Sustainable development governance

40. At the 2nd meeting, on 27 May, the Chairman opened the multi-stakeholder dialogue and made a statement.

41. At the same meeting, presentations on sustainable development governance were made by the representatives of the following major group partners: women, youth, indigenous peoples, non-governmental organizations, local authorities, trade unions, business and industry, scientific and technological communities, and farmers.

42. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of the United States and South Africa gave initial reactions to the presentations made by the major group partners.

Sustainable development governance at the local level

43. At the 2nd meeting, on 27 May, the Chairman initiated the interactive dialogue.

44. At the same meeting, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee held an interactive dialogue on sustainable development governance at the local level, during which interventions were made by the representatives of local authorities, trade unions, Spain (on behalf of the European Community), business and industry, non-governmental organizations, scientific and technological communities, and women.

Sustainable development governance at the national level

45. At the 2nd meeting, on 27 May, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee held an interactive dialogue on sustainable development governance at the national level, during which interventions were made by the representatives of business and industry, trade unions, Belgium, youth, scientific and technological communities, indigenous peoples, farmers and the United States.

Sustainable development governance at the regional and global levels

46. At the 2nd meeting, on 27 May, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee held an interactive

dialogue on sustainable development governance at the regional and global levels, during which interventions were made by the representatives of non-governmental organizations, trade unions, Finland, women, local authorities, youth, indigenous peoples, business and industry.

47. At the same meeting, the Co-Chairpersons of Working Group III, Lars-Göran Engfeldt (Sweden) and Ositadinma Anaedu (Nigeria), commented on the dialogues.

Discussion Groups I and II

48. The Commission acting as the preparatory committee held two discussion groups as part of the multi-stakeholder dialogue: Discussion Group I on capacity-building for sustainable development, co-chaired by Richard Ballhorn (Canada) and Kyotaka Akasaka (Japan), and Discussion Group II on major groups framework for partnership initiatives, co-chaired by Jan Kára (Czech Republic) and Diane Marie Quarless (Jamaica).

Discussion Group I (Capacity-building for sustainable development)

49. At the 3rd meeting, on 29 May, the Co-Chairpersons of Discussion Group I on capacity-building for sustainable development, Richard Ballhorn (Canada) and Kyotaka Akasaka (Japan), summarized the discussions in the Group.

50. At the same meeting, statements were made by the representatives of the following major group partners: women, youth, indigenous peoples, non-governmental organizations, local authorities, trade unions, business and industry, scientific and technological communities, and farmers.

Discussion Group II (Major groups framework for partnership initiatives)

51. At the 3rd meeting, on 29 May, the Co-Chairpersons of Discussion Group II on major groups framework for partnership initiatives, Jan Kára (Czech Republic) and Diane Marie Quarless (Jamaica), summarized the discussions in the Group.

52. At the same meeting, statements were made by the representatives of the following major group partners: women, youth, indigenous peoples, non-governmental organizations, local authorities, trade unions, business and industry, scientific and technological communities, and farmers.

53. Also at the same meeting, statements on the outcome of the discussion groups were made by Norway and Spain (on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the European Union).

Future priorities

54. At the 3rd meeting, on 29 May, statements on future priorities were made by the representatives of farmers, scientific and technological communities, business and industry, trade unions, local authorities, non-governmental organizations, indigenous peoples, youth and women.

55. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia made a statement.

56. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the International Labour Organization made a statement.

57. At the same meeting, statements were made by the Cercle mondial du consensus, a non-governmental organization, and Civil Society (South Africa).

Chairman's summary of the multi-stakeholder dialogue

58. At its 12th meeting, on 7 June, the Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee for the Summit decided to annex to its report the Chairman's summary of the multi-stakeholder dialogue (see annex II).

Vice-Chairpersons' summary of the informal meetings on partnerships for sustainable development

59. At its 12th meeting, on 7 June, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee decided to annex to its report the summary prepared by the Vice-Chairpersons, Jan Kára (Czech Republic) and Diane Marie Quarless (Jamaica), of the informal meetings on partnerships for sustainable development (see annex III).

Chapter IV
High-level ministerial segment

60. The Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee held a high-level ministerial segment at its 6th to 11th meetings, from 5 to 7 June 2002.

61. At the 6th meeting, on 5 June, the Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations delivered an opening address.

62. At the same meeting, the President of the Republic of Indonesia, Megawati Soekarnoputri, addressed the high-level ministerial segment.

63. Also at the same meeting, statements were made by the Co-Chairpersons of the Global Environment Facility of the Ministerial Round Table on Financing for Environment and Sustainable Development, Kjell Larsson, Minister for the Environment of Sweden, and Mohammed Valli Moosa, Minister for Environmental Affairs and Tourism of South Africa.

64. At the same meeting, Precious Negelale, Minister of State of Water Resources of Nigeria, made a statement on behalf of the African Ministers Conference on Water.

Interactive dialogue on the implementation document

65. At the 6th meeting, on 5 June, the Chairman opened the interactive dialogue and made a statement.

66. At the same meeting, interventions on the implementation document were made by the representatives of Japan, Norway, Venezuela (on behalf of the States Members of the Group of 77 and China), Spain (on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the European Union), Colombia, Egypt, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, China, Switzerland, Slovakia, the Dominican Republic, the United Arab Emirates and Indonesia.

67. Also at the same meeting, the President of the Economic and Social Council made an intervention.

68. At the 7th meeting, on 5 June, interventions were made by the representatives of Bhutan, Nigeria, Romania, Uganda, Brazil, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Iceland, Samoa, the United States, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, Sweden, Malaysia, Côte d'Ivoire, Bangladesh, Uzbekistan, the Czech Republic, Iraq, Morocco, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mauritius, Niger, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Andorra, Algeria, Cuba, Portugal, Armenia and Kenya.

69. At the same meeting, interventions were made by the representatives of IUCN, OECD and IPU.

Interactive dialogue on implementation partnerships/initiatives

70. At the 8th meeting, on 6 June, interventions on implementation partnerships/initiatives were made by the representatives of the Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Azerbaijan, the Sudan, New Zealand, Spain (on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the European Union), Qatar, Greece, Barbados, Italy, Japan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Ghana, Nauru, Botswana, Canada, Saudi Arabia, Namibia, Lebanon, India, Norway, the United States, the Philippines, Togo, Tajikistan (on behalf of the countries of the Central Asian Region), Thailand, Zambia, Australia, El Salvador, Bolivia, Maldives, Romania and the Marshall Islands.

71. At the same meeting, the representative of ESCAP made an intervention on behalf of the regional commissions.

72. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Common Fund for Commodities made an intervention.

73. At the same meeting, the representative of business and industry made an intervention.

74. At the 9th meeting, on 6 June, interventions were made by Mozambique, Finland, Turkey, Jordan, Belgium, Nepal, Nigeria, Cuba, Iceland, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, Pakistan, South Africa, Kyrgyzstan, Yugoslavia, China, Ireland, Senegal, Honduras, Belize, Gabon, Uganda, Benin, Chad, Guyana, Panama, the Bahamas, the Solomon Islands, Austria, New Zealand and Romania.

75. At the same meeting, the representative of UNIDO made an intervention.

76. Also at the same meeting, the representative of ESA made an intervention.

77. At the same meeting, the representative of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal made an intervention.

78. Also at the same meeting, concluding remarks were made by the Vice-Chairpersons acting as Facilitators for partnerships initiatives, Jan Kára (Czech Republic) and Diane Marie Quarless (Jamaica).

Interactive dialogue on elements of a political document

79. At the 10th meeting, on 7 June, interventions on elements of a political document were made by the representatives of Mauritius, Cuba, Romania, Cyprus, the Russian Federation, Thailand, the Philippines, Namibia, Kenya, Mozambique, Spain (on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the European Union), Tunisia, Chile, Indonesia, the Dominican Republic, China, Mexico, Costa Rica, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, Uganda, Canada, Ukraine, Colombia, Bolivia, Bhutan, Lesotho, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Gabon, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Nepal, Côte d'Ivoire, Iraq, Barbados (on behalf of the CARICOM countries) and the Netherlands.

80. At the same meeting, the representative of Palestine made an intervention.

81. Also at the same meeting, interventions were made by the representatives of UNESCO and the ILO.

82. At the same meeting, the representative of the Commonwealth of Independent States made an intervention.

83. Also at the same meeting, the representative of UNAIDS made an intervention.

84. At the 11th meeting, on 7 June, interventions were made by the representatives of Honduras, Jamaica, Norway, Belgium, Greece, Botswana, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Switzerland, El Salvador, Zimbabwe, Panama, the United States, Kuwait, Australia, Japan, Egypt, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Nigeria, Peru and Armenia.

85. At the same meeting, interventions were made by the representatives of WMO and WHO.

86. Also at the same meeting, interventions were made by the representatives of UNICEF and UNFPA.

Chairman's summary of the high-level ministerial segment

87. At the 12th meeting, on 7 June, the Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee decided to annex to its report the Chairman's summary of the high-level ministerial segment as contained in document A/CONF.199/PC/CRP.3 (see annex I).

Chapter V
Draft plan of implementation for the Summit

88. At the 1st meeting, on 27 May, the Chairman introduced the revised Chairman's paper concerning a draft plan of implementation for the Summit (A/CONF.199/PC/L.1/Rev.1).

89. At the 12th meeting, on 7 June, the Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee had before it the draft plan of implementation for the Summit (A/CONF.199/PC/L.5 and Add.1-5), which was the result of the consultations held in the working groups and other negotiating groups.

90. At the same meeting, the representative of the Division for Sustainable Development read out revisions to the draft plan of implementation agreed as a result of further consultations.

91. Also at the same meeting, upon the proposal of the Chairman, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee agreed to consider, as a basis for further consideration at the Summit, the text of the draft plan of implementation contained in document A/CONF.199/PC/L.5 and Add.1-5 as agreed, including the revisions read out by the representative of the Division.

92. At the same meeting, the following oral proposals concerning the text of the draft plan of implementation were made:

(a) The representative of Brazil, as the Co-Chair of Working Group I, noted that paragraph 5 *quater* did not appear in the draft plan of implementation, having been set aside for consultations at an earlier stage of the negotiations. Since paragraph 5 *quater* had not been fully considered during the final preparatory meeting, it should be reflected in the text

for discussion at the Summit. The text to be considered, which was in bold square-bracketed type, read as follows: [**We acknowledge the importance of ethics for sustainable development, and therefore we emphasize the need for concrete action to promote discussion on this issue in relevant international forums.**];

(b) The representative of Canada stated the belief that contrary to the indication given in the text, paragraph 47 was not agreed. The representative also proposed the addition, to be inserted into paragraph 47 in the first sentence after the words "and affordable manner", of the words [**in conformity with all human rights and fundamental freedoms**]. The representatives of the European Union, Switzerland, Sweden and Australia expressed support for the Canadian position. The representative of the United States stated the belief that, as indicated in the text, paragraph 47 was agreed and should not be reopened;

(c) The representative of India reserved the right to revisit paragraphs 4, 88 *bis*, 88 *ter*, 88 *quater* and 98 *bis*, as reflected in the edited text. The representative noted that paragraph 4 had not been agreed to and had been referred to a contact group. Paragraphs 88 *bis* and 88 *ter* had only been considered in limited informal consultations and had a different status from paragraphs which had been considered and agreed to in working groups. The representative also stated that it had not been agreed to move former 88 *ter* to new 98 *bis* and that the paragraphs should remain numbered as they had been in document A/CONF.199/L.5 and Add.1-5. The representative of the United States stated that paragraphs 88 *ter* and 98 *bis* were agreed paragraphs and should not be reopened;

(d) The representative of Norway expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which informal consultations had been carried out with respect to paragraph 36, and reiterated its proposal to include the phrase, "Urge countries to ratify the Kyoto Protocol". The representative of the United States opposed the proposal and suggested that paragraph 36 be replaced with paragraph 1 of the Marrakech Declaration;

(e) The representative of Switzerland, with regard to the first line of paragraph 22, called for the deletion of the words "as stated in chapter 19 of Agenda 21";

(f) The representative of Japan, as the Co-Chair of Working Group I, noted that the subparagraphs of paragraph 36, although not so marked, had been agreed subject to agreement on the chapeau;

(g) The representative of Nigeria stated that subparagraphs 139 (a) and (b) could be deleted given agreement on paragraph 139 (c);

(h) Also at the same meeting, general statements on the draft plan of implementation were made by South Africa, Venezuela (on behalf of the Group of 77 and China), Spain (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Yugoslavia), Japan, the United States and Lebanon.

Action taken

93. At its 12th meeting, on 7 June, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee decided to transmit to the Summit for further consideration the draft plan of implementation, as contained in document A/CONF.199/PC/L.5 and Add.1-5 and orally revised (for the text, see A/CONF.199/PC/L.1), and authorized the Chairman, working in cooperation with South Africa as the host of the Summit, to facilitate achieving agreement on all outstanding issues in the interim period (see chap. X, decision 2002/PC/4).

Chapter VI
Elaboration of possible elements for a political document to be submitted for consideration and adoption by heads of State or Government at the Summit

94. At its 12th meeting, on 7 June, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee decided to authorize the Chairman to prepare elements for a political document, on the basis of discussions held during the ministerial segment (see chap. X, decision 2002/PC/5).

Chapter VII
Matters related to the organization of the work of the Summit

95. At its 12th meeting, on 7 June, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee had before it a draft decision on matters related to the organization of the work of the Summit (A/CONF.199/PC/L.7), submitted by the Chairman on behalf of the Bureau, to which the representative of the Division for Sustainable Development read out revisions.

96. At the same meeting, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee adopted the draft decision, as orally revised (see chap. X, decision 2002/PC/6).

97. Also at the same meeting, the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs and Secretary-General of the Summit made a statement of clarification in response to statements made by the representatives of Spain (on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the European Union) and Belgium.

Chapter VIII
Expression of thanks to the people and Government of Indonesia

98. At its 12th meeting, on 7 June, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee adopted a draft decision entitled "Expression of thanks to the people and Government of Indonesia", which was introduced by the representative of Venezuela (on behalf of the States Members of the Group of 77 and China) (see chap. X, decision 2002/PC/7).

Chapter IX
Adoption of the report

99. At its 12th meeting, on 7 June, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee adopted the draft report contained in document A/CONF.199/PC/L.6, as introduced by the Vice-Chairperson-cum-Rapporteur, Diane Marie Quarless (Jamaica), and authorized her to finalize it by incorporating therein the proceedings of its most recent meetings.

Chapter X
Decisions adopted by the Commission acting as the preparatory committee

100. At its 12th meeting, on 7 June 2002, the Commission acting as the preparatory committee adopted the following decisions:

Decision 2002/PC/4
Draft plan of implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development

The Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee for the World Summit on Sustainable Development decides to transmit to the Summit for further consideration the draft plan of implementation of the Summit, as contained in document A/CONF.199/PC/L.5 and Add.1-5, including the revisions read out by the representative of the Division for Sustainable Development of the United Nations Secretariat at the 12th meeting of its fourth session (for the text, see document A/CONF.199/L.1), and entrusts its Chairman, working in cooperation with South Africa as the host of the Summit, to facilitate agreement on all outstanding issues in the interim period.

Decision 2002/PC/5
Elaboration of possible elements for a political document to be submitted for consideration and adoption by heads of State or Government at the World Summit on Sustainable Development

The Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee for the World Summit on Sustainable Development decides to entrust its Chairman to prepare elements for a political document to be considered at the Summit, on the basis of discussions held during the high-level ministerial segment, which elements would subsequently be posted on the official web site of the Summit.

Decision 2002/PC/6
Matters relating to the organization of the work of the World Summit on Sustainable Development

The Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee for the World Summit on Sustainable Development, recalling its

decision taken at its organizational session entitled "Tentative organization of work during the World Summit on Sustainable Development", and also recalling General Assembly resolution 56/226 of 24 December 2001, in which the Assembly requested the Commission acting as the preparatory committee to decide on all remaining issues related to the organization of work of the Summit, including specific details of the series of events to be held in partnership with stakeholders, the short multi-stakeholder event involving the highest level of representation from major groups and Governments and the round-table meetings to be held at the level of heads of State or Government:

(a) Decides that the series of partnership events involving stakeholders, which, in accordance with its decision at its first session, will take place in the plenary during the first week of the Summit, will provide an opportunity for:

(i) Recognizing partnerships and initiatives organized by Governments, international organizations and major groups in support of the implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the Summit;

(ii) Generating further partnerships and initiatives in support of the implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the Summit;

(iii) Identifying areas that did not attract partnerships and that would require further work after the conclusion of the Summit;

(iv) An interactive discussion with the participation of heads of international organizations and financial institutions on the role of multilateral institutions in the implementation of sustainable development at all levels;

(b) Decides also that the general debate to be held in the plenary during the period 2 to 4 September will be open to all States and will be organized as follows: Monday, 2 September (morning, afternoon and evening sessions, if required), Tuesday, 3 September (morning, afternoon and evening sessions, if required) and Wednesday, 4 September 2002 (morning session); and that the time limit for statements will be five minutes. The list of speakers will be established by drawing of lots, in accordance with the customary protocol that ensures that heads of State or Government speak first, followed by ministers, followed by other heads of delegation;

(c) Decides further, taking into account the provisions of subparagraph (b) above, that general statements by entities, intergovernmental organizations and other entities that have received a standing invitation from the United Nations General Assembly to participate in their capacity of observers in the sessions and work of all international conferences convened under its auspices, specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations, interested United Nations organs, representatives of major non-governmental organizations and other major groups accredited to the Summit, and associate members of regional commissions will be made in the plenary on Thursday, 29 August, and Friday, 30 August 2002;

(d) Decides that the short multi-stakeholder event involving the highest level of representation from both major groups and Governments will take place on Wednesday, 4 September 2002, after the conclusion of the general debate in the plenary and before adoption of the final documents and the closure of the Summit. The objective of that event will be to provide a forum for all major groups to renew their commitment to sustainable development and to the implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the Summit;

(e) Decides also that four round tables, at the level of heads of State or Government, will be organized in parallel with the general debate, on one theme, "Making it happen!". The round tables will be held on Monday, 2 September 2002, from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m., on Tuesday, 3 September, from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m., and on Wednesday, 4 September, from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., and will have the following modalities:

(i) Each of the round tables will comprise 70 seats: up to 50 for Government delegations and 20 for other participants, including the specialized agencies of the United Nations and related organizations and major groups;

(ii) Any given State, international organization or representative of a major group can participate in only one of the round tables;

(iii) Only heads of State or Government participating in a round table can be accompanied by an additional person, who will be seated behind;

(iv) Generally, only heads of State or Government will be invited to speak during the round tables;

(v) A limited number of heads of United Nations organizations and agencies, which are members of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, as well as chief executive officers of private enterprises and representatives at similar levels from other major groups, may also be invited to speak at the round tables;

(vi) The round tables will be chaired by heads of State or Government, who will be invited by the President of the Summit to perform that function. The chairpersons of the four round tables will come from the Asian Group, the Eastern European Group, the Latin American and Caribbean Group, and the Group of Western European and other States;

(vii) States will be invited by the Secretariat to inscribe in order to participate in one of the round tables in advance of the Summit, bearing in mind that the total number of States participating in any given round table should not exceed 50, as provided in paragraph 5 (i) above;

(viii) The proceedings of the round tables will be telecast in an "overflow room" that will be open to the media;

(ix) The outcomes of the round tables will be reflected in the summaries of the chairpersons, which will be reported to the closing plenary meeting of the Summit and included in the final report of the Summit;

(f) Palestine, in its capacity as observer, shall participate in the general debate and one of the round tables provided that it is represented by its highest ranking official.

Decision 2002/PC/7
Expression of thanks to the people and Government of Indonesia

The Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee for the World Summit on Sustainable Development, having met in Bali, Indonesia, from 27 May to 7 June 2002 at the invitation of the Government of Indonesia:

(a) Expresses its deep appreciation to Her Excellency Megawati Soekarnoputri, President of the Republic of Indonesia and Government of Indonesia, for having made it possible for the fourth session of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee to be held in Indonesia and for the excellent facilities, staff and services so graciously placed at its disposal;

(b) Requests the Government of Indonesia to convey to the people of the Island of Bali and Indonesia the gratitude of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee for the hospitality and warm welcome extended to the participants.

Annex I

Chairman's summary of the high-level ministerial segment

1. The ministerial dialogue was formally convened with statements by the Deputy Secretary General of the United Nations and by Megawati Soekarnoputri, President of Indonesia. Both stressed the importance of the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development for the future of the world's people and environment, and urged ministers and delegates to work towards a strong plan of implementation that would further the goals and principles of Agenda 21. Statements were also heard from the three Co-Chairs of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Ministerial Round Table on Financing for Sustainable Development.

2. During the dialogue, ministers addressed issues related to preparing for implementation and developing guidelines for partnerships, and suggested elements for a political declaration. The Chairman stressed the importance of balancing the three pillars of sustainable development, and invited statements from ministers on those areas of discussion.

Ministerial interactive dialogue

3. Ministers reaffirmed their commitment to Agenda 21, the Rio principles and the other outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, and called for their full implementation. Many ministers stressed the importance of working to preserve the natural environment and the natural resource base for future generations. A people-centred approach should be taken to sustainable development, keeping in mind the urgency of poverty alleviation. In the second decade after UNCED, the world must work towards creating a culture of sustainable development, including ethical values that took into account cultural and traditional differences while acknowledging the need for all people to work towards living in harmony with nature.

4. Regarding the plan of implementation currently under negotiation, a number of ministers stressed the importance of setting clear time-bound targets, including commitments for new and additional resources. There was strong agreement that efforts should be focused on achieving the goals stated in Agenda 21, and that countries should not renegotiate agreed principles and commitments from UNCED or other international agreements and conventions. A number of ministers called for the ratification of existing agreements and conventions, including the Cartagena and Kyoto Protocols, emphasizing their incorporation of the precautionary principle. Several ministers also reaffirmed support for the values and principles contained in the Earth Charter.

5. Changing unsustainable consumption and production patterns was emphasized as a critical objective that must be met in order to achieve the goals of Agenda 21. Ministers stressed the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, calling on developed countries to take the lead in changing unsustainable patterns of behaviour. Concern over the emphasis on voluntary efforts was raised, and the need for more specific regulations was noted. Others noted that the role of the private sector in eradicating poverty and making globalization more sustainable could not be ignored, but stressed the need for equal partnerships within the private sector and among all sectors of civil society. While acknowledging that globalization offered both risks and opportunities, some stated that an equitable approach involving all nations in decision-making processes was essential.

6. The importance of addressing discrepancies between current global trade regimes and sustainable development was a priority for many, and it was stressed that equity and equality should serve as key concepts in integrating social concerns into the architecture of global trade and finance. Specifically, ministers emphasized the need for an enabling environment to implement agreements forged at Doha and at Monterrey, and several also indicated their willingness to work towards such action. A number of speakers called for the elimination of trade-distorting subsidies.

7. Increased access to markets and debt relief were cited as crucial if developing countries were to gain the resources needed to implement Agenda 21. Many supported stronger financial commitments, including meeting the internationally agreed target of 0.7 per cent of gross domestic product (GDP) for official development assistance (ODA), and the transfer of clean technologies accompanied by training and

capacity-building. Some supported debt cancellation for the poorest countries. The creation of a human solidarity fund was also discussed. Several ministers expressed their commitment to halving the number of people living on less than US$ 1 per day by 2015. Many expressed support for replenishing and strengthening GEF, particularly its small grants programme. Several ministers proposed incorporating GEF as the financial mechanism for the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa.

8. Providing access to water and sanitation, preventing desertification and conserving biodiversity were repeatedly stressed as key areas in which action should be taken and commitments made. Specific targets for sanitation, water and renewable energy were identified as the most realistic areas in which commitments could be met. Strengthened local institutional capacities for human settlements, provision of adequate shelter, promotion of sustainable agriculture to ensure food security and access to land and water resources were also highlighted as key areas of concern. Actions to address poverty and health issues were given priority by many ministers, and in that context the need to combat HIV/AIDS and other communicable diseases was cited as critical to promoting sustainable development.

9. Education was cited as essential for poverty eradication and changing unsustainable consumption and production patterns. Improved education systems were also important for improving health and participation in decision-making.

10. Many agreed that scarcity of water was a fundamental issue. Water was an increasingly rare resource and had become a cause of conflict within and among countries. Many ministers expressed their commitment to the goal of reducing by half the number of people lacking access to safe drinking water by 2015. Several supported enhancing river-based initiatives involving countries sharing international river basins, and highlighted the need to elaborate integrated regional programmes for integrated coastal and marine resource management. The need for an inter-agency coordination mechanism on oceans within the United Nations system was also identified.

11. Energy and agriculture were identified as other key areas for maintaining the strength of countries and ensuring sustainable development. Poor air quality, including urban air pollution and acid rain, were also cited as major issues of concern. Although those specific sectors were discussed at length, it was stated that sectoral issues should not be taken individually and attention must be given to chapter 38 of Agenda 21, which called for an integrated approach to sustainable development. In that way, it was acknowledged that all sectors were interrelated and no one resource could be conserved without ensuring the protection of the others.

12. Biodiversity and climate change were identified as areas that must be addressed in an integrated manner, as well as desertification, especially in Africa. A number of ministers suggested that cooperation should be fostered through workshops to exchange information and ensure common implementation frameworks within the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention to Combat Desertification. It was noted that the Marrakech Ministerial Declaration could contribute to the Summit and ensure interlinkages to climate change. Adoption of a goal to halt and reverse at the global and national level the current trend of loss in natural resources by 2015 was highlighted, as well as a goal to halt the loss of biodiversity by having the necessary instruments in place by 2010, as agreed at the sixth meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

13. The importance of good governance and creating an enabling environment at both the national and international levels was discussed. Democracy and an open, participatory approach to decision-making were stated as critical to furthering the goals of sustainable development. A gender-balanced approach should be taken to policy-making, with major groups, including indigenous peoples and youth, involved in sustainable development programmes and policies.

14. Armed conflict was highlighted as an impediment to sustainable development, and ministers called for promotion of peace, solidarity and justice in areas ravaged by war. They urged that steps be taken to end foreign occupation and eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Several ministers also stressed that unilateral sanctions created major obstacles to sustainable development and should be abolished.

Partnerships

15. On the issue of partnerships for sustainable development ("type two" outcomes), ministers engaged in discussions on the role of those partnerships in the context of the Summit, with a view to drafting guiding principles for those partnerships to guide the development of those outcomes from the Summit. It was widely agreed that partnerships were critical for implementation of the goals of Agenda 21 and may provide the best way to deliver concrete results. Ministers called for partnerships that incorporated the three pillars of sustainable development and were sensitive to regional and national characteristics.

16. Many ministers repeatedly stressed that partnerships could not be used as substitutes for intergovernmental commitments but should serve as mechanisms for implementing them. Most agreed that Governments should not use partnerships as a way to avoid responsibility. Good governance, particularly at the local level, as well as the importance of creating an enabling environment for the creation and implementation of partnerships, were also mentioned.

17. Ministers agreed that the participation of major groups and stakeholders from the early stages of the process of creating partnerships was required in order for initiatives to be transparent and fully participatory. The importance of ownership of partnership initiatives was stressed, including the effective participation of youth, women and indigenous people. The principles of equality, responsibility and accountability were considered essential for sound initiatives. Elements of efficiency, coherence and impact or effect were also cited as valuable, as were mutual respect and trust. Some also supported consideration of spiritual and cultural values in promoting sustainable development.

18. The importance of securing resources for partnerships was discussed at length. Ministers stipulated that partnerships should not be made with already committed resources but with new financing, and that already existing programmes should not be renamed and launched as new partnerships for sustainable development. Resources should be distributed evenly and judiciously, and neither ODA nor resources for partnerships should be used for political purposes. The creation of a public-private joint venture capital fund for financing of partnerships was suggested. Others stated that it was important to minimize administrative costs and to ensure that the maximum amount of resources would reach the intended purpose of any partnership and that no unnecessary bureaucracy was created.

19. Several observed that partnerships had great potential to widen the resource base for the implementation of Agenda 21, generate new resources and bring new and different actors together. One minister highlighted the establishment of an environmental award providing US$ 1 million every two years for an outstanding achievement at the international level, such as partnership for integrated management of water resources. The private sector was identified repeatedly as a key actor in developing successful partnerships, and its role as both a stakeholder and an investor was discussed. Several underscored the need to address the relative power and influence of corporation in partnerships. In that regard, the importance of access to information by all partners was highlighted.

20. Partnerships for good governance were viewed by some as essential for enhancing synergy among Governments and integrating the private sector, while others added that they should be open, transparent and accountable. Several called for promoting international joint efforts to provide adequate financial resources for developing countries to enable them to implement national and international environmental accords. Some pointed to the need for partnerships to take into account the difficult situations of the least developed countries. Others noted that sustainable development principles and partnerships could provide a sound basis for economic reforms in countries with economies in transition. High turnover in government was recognized as a problem in that regard.

21. It was clear to most that serious attention should be given to the process that would conceptualize how partnerships would help to address the major areas identified by the Secretary-General, as well as other priority partnership areas, such as education and capacity-building. It was widely accepted that partnerships should be linked to United Nations Millennium Declaration goals.

22. Although many endorsed the establishment of a set of guidelines for partnerships and the creation of a monitoring system to ensure implementation, others argued that voluntary measures allowing partners to create their own partnerships mechanisms for ensuring implementation and evaluation of progress would be

most conducive to creative innovative initiatives. The need for development of indicators for sustainable development to monitor implementation of Agenda 21 was also highlighted, as was the potential for the Commission on Sustainable Development to serve as a focal point for partnerships and a forum for exchanging ideas and lessons learned. Many felt that monitoring and reporting should not require additional layers of administration at the national level, and suggested that a minimum level of detail be defined that could be incorporated in monitoring and assessment in the review process.

23. Many ministers referred to the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) as a good example of a regional initiative and supported the adoption of decisions to foster partnerships for better coordination of regional activities and initiatives. Others emphasized South-South cooperation for partnerships and the establishment of national and regional centres for sustainable development. Several spoke in favour of actions related to small island developing States, supporting implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States. With its goal of halving the number of those with lack of adequate sanitation by 2015, in addition to similar goals for water provision, the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Campaign was presented as a model of a multi-stakeholder partnership launched in South Africa in 2002. The Campaign was a demonstration of how global initiatives could connect with partnerships at the local, national and regional levels.

24. Examples of partnerships at the national level were the focus of many statements, and several noted success in enacting national sustainable development legislation in their countries. Poverty alleviation was cited as a priority in partnership efforts at that level. Other important areas included health, education, water, desertification, energy, biodiversity conservation, natural resource management, and development and transfer of clean technology. Partnerships involving geothermal energy for use in developing countries and supporting sustainable mountain development in the United Nations Year of the Mountains were also highlighted.

25. Local Agenda 21s were cited as the main instruments for enabling successful partnerships at the community level. Interlinked areas, such as the status of women, health and clean energy, were recognized as best dealt with at the community level through microlevel development and involvement of major stakeholders. Responding to a comment on mainstreaming sustainable development, one minister stated that participatory partnerships must ensure the involvement of voters and communities in understanding sustainable development.

Political document

26. Ministers agreed that the political document should be short, concise, focused and action-oriented. It should reiterate basic principles, reaffirm commitments and strengthen multilateral cooperation for implementation of sustainable development.

27. High priority was given to reaffirmation of the commitment to further the implementation of Agenda 21 and the Rio principles, through mutual global partnerships in line with common but differentiated responsibilities and upholding the three pillars of sustainable development. Many called for inclusion of language that would reaffirm the Earth Charter as an ethical basis for sustainable development. Support was also expressed for language on achieving the millennium development goals, ensuring follow-up to the World Trade Organization (WTO) ministerial round at Doha and the International Conference on Financing for Development held at Monterrey, implementing existing multilateral environmental agreements and ratifying other conventions and agreements, including the Kyoto and Cartagena Protocols. Endorsement of and commitment to agreed time targets on energy and other issues contained in the draft plan of implementation were also emphasized.

28. The eradication of poverty was identified by most as a top priority area to be addressed in the declaration. To that end, suggestions were heard from many ministers on taking concrete steps to establish an international solidarity fund, increasing developing country access to international markets and removing discriminatory trade barriers, and phasing out environmentally harmful and trade-distorting subsidies. Many supported language on meeting ODA targets, fostering coordination among Bretton Woods institutions, ensuring equity in global finance, enacting measures to combat corruption and enabling an open and transparent participatory approach at all levels. For the highly indebted and least developed countries, references to debt swap for global ecological services and debt cancellation in least developed countries were

suggested. A number of ministers supported strengthening opportunities to work in partnership to mobilize resources to unleash human productivity, promote sharing of experiences within and among regions, reduce trade barriers, and meet the challenge of ensuring that all countries and all sectors of society could reap the benefits of globalization.

29. Several ministers spoke out against foreign occupation and military conflict, calling for the protection of those under occupation and addressing the need to minimize the negative impacts of sanctions on sustainable development efforts. The peaceful settlement of disputes, the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, and bringing an end to foreign occupation and unilateral sanctions were all deemed by a number of ministers as necessary prerequisites for sustainable development.

30. Commitment to good governance and efforts to improve public management was mentioned by many ministers, and several reasserted that Governments had the primary responsibility for sustainable development, while others noted that respect for the sovereign rights of States over natural resources should be recognized and upheld. Many called for reaffirmation of political commitment and determination to create the necessary tools for implementation. The need for commitment to sustainable development at the community level was also highlighted.

31. Capacity-building and scientific and technological cooperation to bridge the digital divide and ensure follow-up and monitoring of the sustainable development progress was raised as another central issue to be addressed in the declaration. Points were made on the need for dissemination of information to address gaps in sustainable development education and knowledge, and for global research centres for sustainable development that could provide access to information and develop support systems in connection with decision-making.

32. Many stated that the document should promote respect for human rights and cultural diversity; recognize the autonomy of indigenous people; reinforce the social pillar through employment creation for youth in particular; stress the key role of women and their equal participation in sustainable development, including access to natural resources; and articulate a vision for the future that could inspire hope in youth and children. Several ministers also called for inclusion of educators and the media in major groups.

33. It was agreed that the political document should endorse the draft plan of implementation, express awareness of a new sense of global interdependence, recognize the complexity of the issues involved, and reflect the need to strengthen international institutional frameworks and integrate the environmental pillar into existing institutions. Some ministers supported a section addressing the objectives of the draft plan of implementation related to sustainable development principles in the five key areas of water and sanitation, energy, health, agriculture and biodiversity.

34. Coordinated efforts to implement the Convention to Combat Desertification, the Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity were highlighted by a number of ministers, and many stressed the importance of biodiversity conservation and the incorporation of the precautionary principle. Mountain and ocean ecosystems were highlighted as areas of importance in that context.

35. Commitment to the special needs of Africa and small island developing States was reflected in support for regional initiatives and development frameworks, including the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and NEPAD. South-South cooperation was emphasized as key to future progress in implementation, and strong political support was given for initiatives to combat HIV/AIDS.

Annex II

Chairman's summary of the multi-stakeholders dialogue segment

1. The Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, at its fourth session, included a multi-stakeholders dialogue segment from 27 to 29 May 2002, involving Governments and all nine major groups of Agenda 21. The segment consisted of four sessions, starting with a plenary discussion on sustainable development governance, continuing with two parallel discussion groups (one on capacity-building for sustainable development and the other on a major group framework for partnership initiatives) and concluding with a final plenary aiming to identify major groups' priorities for the future. The Chairman of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee, Emil Salim, chaired the plenary sessions. Discussion Group I was co-chaired by Kiyotaka Akasaka (Japan) and Richard Ballhorn (Canada), and facilitated by Paul Hohnen. Discussion Group II was co-chaired by Diane Quarless (Jamaica) and Jan Kára (Czech Republic) and facilitated by Ida Koppen.

Opening plenary
Sustainable development governance

Presentations

2. Women recalled the vision from the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) linking economic, social and environmental sectors and involving common but differentiated responsibilities, and stated that that vision required strong global, national and subnational institutions with the necessary mandate, authority and resources. They asked for more participation in decision-making, and called for governmental action in priority areas of globalization, gender justice, transparency and accountability. Indigenous people emphasized that governance structures gave disproportionate power to economic elites to decide the future, and noted the impact on indigenous lands caused by extractive industries. They stressed the priority areas of increasing respect for indigenous rights and territories, upholding indigenous self-development and their prior informed consent, and promoting corporate accountability.

3. NGOs addressed participatory rights in decision-making, the role of financial and trade institutions and corporate governance. Referring to principle 10 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, they noted that good governance demanded public participation, access to information and access to justice. They noted that decisions by the World Trade Organization (WTO) and international financial institutions have accelerated unsustainable practices and debt, and supported use of the precautionary principle in international trade. They stressed more government authority over corporations. Trade unions highlighted workers' participation, particularly in such areas as energy, water, health and climate change. They proposed conducting workplace assessments over the next decade to assess progress and support workers participation in seeking joint solutions, and challenged employers and Governments to make that happen. They also supported workplace-based partnerships in governance structures. Local authorities noted the success of local initiatives since UNCED and stressed that national Governments should acknowledge the role they could play in assisting national Agenda 21 implementation. They emphasized that local government is not "non-government" but the sphere of government closest to the people and thus to implementation initiatives.

4. Business and industry welcomed the combination of type one and type two outcomes, stressing inclusion of stakeholders as essential for the success of the emerging sustainable development partnership paradigm. Noting that corruption could circumvent tax and revenue benefits for communities, they supported transparency and the Global Reporting Initiative in that context. The scientific and technological communities emphasized the need to improve collaboration between scientists and policy makers. They supported dialogue at all levels to ensure policy relevance, education in science and technology for sustainable development, capacity-building to bridge the North-South divide, access to information, including remote sensing for monitoring, and proposed establishing an advisory panel on science and technology for the Commission on Sustainable Development.

5. Farmers noted the need to ensure food security and safety, and called for policies addressing domestic markets, rural development, and better access to and management of natural resources. They underscored greater involvement of farmers at all levels of decision-making, and stressed that increasing trade is good only if it enhances prosperity for rural people. Youth stressed the promise of UNCED for intergenerational equity and called for more action-oriented outcome from the Summit while noting that the power of transnational corporations might have undue influence on that process. They advocated major group-based participation in the Economic and Social Council, supported redirecting military spending for sustainable development purposes and demanded sustainable development education.

6. The United States and South Africa gave initial reactions. The United States supported the multi-stakeholder dialogue for developing partnerships and delivering concrete results, stressed that the Summit plan of action should carry forward the Monterrey Consensus, emphasized transparency and access to education, suggested the Commission on Sustainable Development as a forum for sharing and discussing partnership initiatives beyond the Summit, and announced their readiness to engage in partnerships related to energy, water, health, education and oceans. South Africa agreed that the Summit must produce means to implement good governance, emphasized the importance of stakeholder input and participation for a successful outcome, and noted that partnerships offered the greatest hope for success.

Dialogue

7. In discussing *local-level issues*, many emphasized the necessity of strong local institutions and linkages between these and intergovernmental modalities. Trade unions raised the question of whether freshwater should be treated as a right or as a commodity, and most major groups spoke out against the privatization of water resources. Business and industry asserted that privatization was an efficient method for delivery of services, while NGOs, scientific and technological communities, women and local authorities emphasized that water resources management should involve community participation, an ecosystem approach and cross-sectoral synergies. They further noted that markets do not serve the poor, and that government subsidies in developing countries often failed. Spain, on behalf of the European Union (EU), described partnership initiatives with local authorities in water and in health. Belgium encouraged synergy among all levels, a further focus on social issues, and supported the International Labour Organization (ILO) concept of the right to jobs.

8. Regarding sustainable development governance at the *national level*, youth proposed the establishment of national councils for sustainable development and supported advertisement-free zones. Business and industry noted that advertising provided useful information, while the scientific and technological communities noted the need to address and improve communication between science and policy makers. Indigenous people expressed the need to ensure scientific information to resolve conflict on issues of sovereignty and sustainable development, citing a case of nuclear dumping in the United States. The United States acknowledged that conflict, and noted that stakeholder input was being sought on the issue. Farmers called on national Governments to implement legal frameworks for protection of small fisher-folk and rural farmers, to ensure social security for rural development, and to engage vulnerable sectors in dialogues at that level.

9. In addressing *regional and international levels* of sustainable development governance, most participants strongly advocated legally binding frameworks for corporate accountability, and appealed to the global community to establish minimum international and regional standards as complements to free trade. Business and industry noted that codes of conduct on corporate responsibility meant different things to different people, according to their culture and traditions, and observed that it was difficult to apply such codes at the international level. He conceded that privatization could be misused but reiterated that it could also be a tool of efficiency.

10. Local authorities noted that globalization had given localization a new importance and that governance issues were increasingiy solved at the local level, including in the workplace, as indicated by trade unions. Indigenous people and youth highlighted regional conflicts arising from the need to share resources, and agreed on the need to define "bad governance" in order to understand "good governance". Indigenous people further stressed inclusion of the cultural and spiritual aspects of sustainable development and called for a change in

attitudes. Finland supported voluntary partnerships as a complement to formal government decision-making. The scientific and technological communities highlighted the linkages between the local, national, regional and global levels, and stressed that good governance required good science at all levels.

11. In concluding comments invited by the Chair, Vice-Chair Engfeldt noted that institutional issues would require a successful mix of tools, and assured participants that major issues would be developed through clear measures at all levels and incorporated into the text on sustainable development governance. Vice-Chair Anaedu recognized the importance of incorporating a gender perspective, observed that the business and industry group was often held accountable by civil society, and stressed the importance of a balance among Governments, business and others. The Chair concluded the session by stating that government was expected to address the fact that markets did not capture non-economic issues, and that capacity-building was one tool to achieve sustainable development governance.

12. During the session, one or more major groups recommended that Governments:

- Adopt a legally binding convention on corporate accountability, with independent mechanisms for monitoring, compliance, enforcement and liability.
- Achieve equal representation of women in political, social and economic decision-making at all levels.
- Address the lack of institutional democracy in the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organization (WTO).
- Include all stakeholders in national sustainable development strategies.
- Adopt a "rights-based" approach to community access and control over natural resources.
- Conclude the Decade of Indigenous People with a world conference on indigenous people and sustainable development, and the adoption of a universal declaration on the rights of indigenous people.
- Utilize the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues as a focal point for sustainable development partnerships and implementation plans.
- Recognize the primary role of local authorities in sustainable development governance.
- Employ local skills and introduce new technologies locally to further poverty eradication.
- Encourage initiatives that promote synergies between official development assistance (ODA), foreign direct investment (FDI) and good governance.
- Establish an advisory panel on science and technology to the Commission on Sustainable Development.
- Launch a research and development initiative, focusing on interactions and interdependencies between social, economic and environmental systems.
- Develop commonly accepted indicators at the national level.
- Assess impacts of international trade agreements on sustainable development.
- Develop partnerships to monitor and control trade and promote policies that address the needs of producer countries.
- Eliminate corruption through initiatives to strengthen local government.
- Ensure that multilateral environmental agreements are not subordinate to or undermined by WTO agreements.
- Establish national youth councils to ensure youth engagement in decision-making.

Discussion Group I
Capacity-building for sustainable development

Presentations

13. Women stressed sustainable development education as a priority, called for capacity-building for gender equality and participation in decision-making, and proposed capacity-building measures such as dissemination of gender disaggregated data and the

establishment of grass-roots women's academies. They indicated the need for commitment of resources for gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting at all levels. Youth stressed holistic formal education that promoted sustainable development principles, and called for establishment of information clearing houses at the subregional level (by 2005), funded by national and local authorities. They advocated the establishment of youth-led local eco-villages for developing sustainable livelihoods, and called for the establishment of national programmes and youth advisory councils to enhance youth participation.

14. Indigenous people pointed out that the emphasis of the current development model on marketing rather than conserving natural resources was inappropriate and not complementary to sustainable development principles. They supported strengthening existing indigenous capacity on the basis of traditional knowledge and indigenous institutions, complementarity between scientific and indigenous knowledge, and technology transfer that respected indigenous identities.

15. NGOs focused on participatory decision-making processes for capacity-building, and advocated empowerment and the decentralization of resources and responsibilities. They considered the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities" to be crucial for genuine and equitable partnerships, and that access to information, modern technology and finance were essential components for capacity-building. Local authorities stressed that building their capacity would lead to improved implementation of sustainable development. They emphasized the need for national-level support to strengthen local capacity, competence and resources. They called upon the Summit process to recognize good local governance in creating sustainable communities and to secure commitments for local capacity-building.

16. Trade unions rejected the current model of development based on liberalization, and called instead for capacity-building that emphasized socio-economic security, training and education, and respect for workers rights. They stressed freedom of association and collective bargaining as essential prerequisites to capacity-building, and advocated workplace assessments and other forms of joint action as important tools. Business and industry pointed to the diversity within their sector, and noted that large and small businesses had different contributions to make to sustainable development at different levels. They noted that business was an important vehicle for capacity-building in developing countries through domestic and international transfer of and investments in knowledge, skills, finance and technology. Good governance, the rule of law and increased funding for scientific research were important to support those ongoing contributions.

17. Scientific and technological communities stressed building and maintaining scientific capacity, and pointed to the worldwide shortage of skills and leadership. They called for new education programmes at all levels, North-South and South-South sharing of knowledge, and efforts to build science-literate civil service at the national level. Stressing the need for strategies appropriate to different needs in different regions of the world, they proposed that capacity-building in the North needed changes in existing institutions, while efforts in the South needed to focus on setting up centres of knowledge to reverse brain drain.

18. Farmers called for partnerships and legal frameworks that enabled income-generating activities. They called upon Governments to provide incentives for sustainable agricultural practices and to ensure a balance between local and export markets. In agreement with other major groups, they advocated participation in decision-making, especially at the grass-roots level. They proposed establishing expert advisory committees for sustainable development to support farmers in developing countries, and called for a fund for strengthening capacity.

19. Initial government responses were made by Spain on behalf of the European Union (EU), Brazil, Sweden, India, Canada, China and Venezuela on behalf of the G-77 Group. The EU emphasized human capacity creation and called for its inclusion in all national plans and policies, and supported the dissemination of science and technology at all levels, the role of private sector, the need for capacity in such sectors as water and energy, and the participation of women, youth and indigenous people. Brazil called for capacity-building through better science and education, and supported the participation of civil society in decision-making. Sweden supported the bottom-up approach of local Agenda 21 initiatives, and called for trade-related technological assistance, debt management and financial stability.

20. India outlined the need to develop inventories that disseminated, replicated and further innovated best practices from developing countries to encourage South-South collaboration. Canada spoke of the overarching need to eradicate poverty, and stated that the ownership of capacity-building processes must be local and build on local assets. China encouraged the promotion of human resource development and finance for capacity-building, and stressed the importance of education. Venezuela encouraged major group inputs into capacity-building processes, especially in developing countries, acknowledging the achievements of indigenous people in improved handling of resources as well as the efforts of local authorities.

21. The afternoon dialogue focused on *successful examples of capacity-building and lessons learned*. The Facilitator encouraged participants to highlight areas requiring further support from Governments and other major groups.

22. The scientific and technological communities referred to the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Engineer Register as an effective mechanism for promoting the mobility of professional engineers among APEC countries, noting the project could benefit from additional funding. Local authorities highlighted city-to-city cooperation through the CityNet Asia programme, and city forums for stakeholder discussions on local Agenda 21s. Lessons learned included the need to diffuse and multiply positive cases, support networks and city-to-city access, and increase exchange of information and training.

23. Trade unions described their partnership with business in Denmark to develop tools and mechanisms in such areas as productivity and health. Lessons learned included the need for basic trust. Business and industry elaborated many instances of industry collaboration with stakeholders, and noted the challenge of creating self-sustaining standards.

24. Farmers described a centralized management system for agricultural reform in Algeria, with a decentralized decision-making structure. They characterized success as true dialogue between the public sector and government. NGOs applauded the small grants programmes of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and other United Nations agencies that helped NGOs and other community groups to create sustainable livelihoods projects that were working efficiently in more than 70 countries, demonstrating the capacity of communities to provide solutions to sustainability.

25. Indigenous people highlighted two experiences dealing with indigenous rights and local natural resource management. The Indigenous People's Rights Act in the Philippines and a capacity-building partnership between indigenous tribes of Nicaragua and Costa Rica both demonstrated the potential of laws to strengthen capacity by ensuring indigenous people's rights.

26. Youth applauded the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Global Youth Forum and the Youth Advisory Council as good examples of youth involvement with international agencies. They noted that activities involving youth were often short term and could benefit from longer-term programmes. Women described radio community programmes in Latin America utilizing the local Agenda 21 framework to build women's capacity and engage other stakeholders in gender mainstreaming; and highlighted peer-to-peer learning programmes in Africa and centres for capacity-building at local and regional levels.

27. A number of countries responded to the comments of major groups with examples of their own experience. France described support from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the establishment of a department to address local capacity-building efforts and a collaborative programme on twinning hospitals. Norway highlighted examples of the regulation of buildings and promoting recycling based on market forces. The United States described a resource cities programme that matched mayors from the United States with local leaders from other countries. Brazil referred to the importance of science academies in the decision-making process. Uganda described examples of participatory agricultural extension through its natural agricultural advisory services for organizing stakeholders. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya highlighted people's congresses, which encouraged participation in decision-making by all citizens above the age of 18.

Dialogue

28. Certain key elements and requirements for capacity-building emerged during the dialogues in the session. Major groups recognized the central role that national and local governments could play in promoting capacity-building, including the

implementation of existing commitments in Agenda 21. They also prioritized enhanced roles of major groups in the capacity-building process, and expressed specific concerns concerning access, transparency, accountability, gender and social equity. Emphasis was also placed on the need for increased capacity-building in academic institutions, in the workplace and in partnerships between civil society and government.

29. The dialogue stressed education and training and the need for unhindered access to and dissemination of information, with specific reference to the techniques and outcomes of scientific research. The scientific and technological communities proposed launching a science education initiative, in collaboration with other major groups. NGOs responded with a list of mechanisms to encourage scientific research and dissemination for capacity-building, such as an information reservoir on all aspects of climate change, the identification of new technologies, and encouraging interdisciplinary research through the establishment of excellence centres and the use of existing research institutions to monitor government actions.

30. Major groups asked Governments how they could provide broad institutional support for networks to record, assess, share and improve successful initiatives and experience. Women proposed a university teachers' initiative based on the integration of sustainable development principles into all curricula. Trade unions advocated the significance of special education and training in the context of joint workplace approaches. Indigenous people called for the establishment of higher educational traditional knowledge institutions. Business and industry noted the importance of well-trained educators and industry's contributions to training.

31. Financial support was identified as a key requirement for capacity-building. Women, youth and NGOs referred to the growing debt of developing countries, and youth specifically called for the cancellation of debt as an essential prerequisite for capacity-building in poor countries. NGOs requested better management of and improved access to existing funds for non-governmental actors. The provision of "seed funding" for specific initiatives was also discussed. Youth called for the establishment of a seed fund from local authorities for youth involvement in community development. Farmers advocated rural banks in developing countries managed by local people for economic empowerment.

32. Strengthened regional and national institutions and networks emerged as another key requirement for capacity-building. Women highlighted the potential of regional and global networks to exchange practical knowledge. NGOs proposed devising a non-governmental act to build structures for a transparent regulatory framework that would provide an accountability process to NGOs. Farmers also proposed the creation of sustainable development councils in each State.

33. The following critical elements for capacity-building emerged from the dialogue:

- Good governance, with participatory, transparent and democratic decision-making mechanisms;
- Partnerships between States and stakeholders in decision-making processes that focused on building mutual capacities;
- Access (to basic services for vital human needs, education, information, modern technology and finance);
- Rights-based approach to sustainable development;
- Prior informed consent in the design and implementation of strategies;
- Science-based decision-making;
- Genuine partnerships with a level playing field and local ownership of the process;
- Common but differentiated responsibilities;
- Workers rights, freedom of association and collective bargaining;
- Respect for cultural diversity.

34. The following means for capacity-building were suggested:

- Education for sustainable development and the eradication of illiteracy;
- Dissemination of information (in local languages, gender-disaggregated);
- Access to information technology and related training;
- Decentralization of resources and responsibilities;
- Enabling environment for employment and income generation;

- Building and maintaining scientific capacity in all countries;
- Human capacity creation as a basis for innovation;
- Trade related technological assistance;
- Strengthened local authorities.

35. Participants also made the following recommendations:

- Create grass-roots academies and peer-to-peer learning institutions;
- Develop gender budgeting, monitoring and resources for gender mainstreaming;
- Establish national youth development programmes for youth participation;
- Enable complementarity between indigenous knowledge and scientific knowledge;
- Strengthen indigenous institutions for promoting knowledge sharing;
- Foster local leadership;
- Enforce and implement existing legislation;
- Recognize business as an important vehicle for capacity-building;
- Ensure balance between local and export markets and expand market access for developing countries;
- Support, promote and finance local Agenda 21 activities and campaigns;
- Develop inventories to disseminate, replicate and further best practices;
- Share environment-friendly technology across countries through an international mechanism;
- Prevent brain drain and build domestic capacity by providing incentives, financing and training for citizens of developing countries.

Discussion Group II
Major groups framework for partnership initiatives

Presentations

36. Women, youth, NGOs and indigenous people stressed that type two outcomes should not be substitutes for type one outcomes, exacerbate unequal power relations, support unsustainable economic development models or inappropriately accelerate the expansion of the private sector's role in providing development services. They also urged strong commitments for corporate accountability and ratification of existing conventions. Youth added that partnerships must be built on intergenerational equity. Indigenous people highlighted paragraph 26.3 of Agenda 21, on recognizing the role of indigenous people and calling for the establishment of processes to empower them, enable their participation in development processes affecting them, and involve them in national sustainable development strategies.

37. NGOs expressed concern over the increasing influence of corporate power in the United Nations and its agencies, stressed the need to ensure that type two initiatives were anchored in type one commitments and proposed that partnerships involve only those Governments that have ratified multilateral environmental agreements. They stipulated that type two initiatives should be transparent, consultative, protect the rights of individuals, not exclude legally enforceable contracts among partners and have credible monitoring mechanisms to allay fears of those who mistrust type two partnerships.

38. Local authorities stressed monitoring and evaluation of type two partnerships as a means to implement targets, noting that partnerships were not an end in themselves. They called for partnerships that were action-oriented, inclusive, transparent and not a replacement for institutional responsibilities. They noted the importance of strengthening local authorities as a bridge between local and international levels of implementation and monitoring. Trade unions noted that type two initiatives were in danger of being the only concrete outcomes of the Summit process unless they were anchored in type one commitments. They noted examples of bad partnerships, highlighting use of accounting techniques to disguise corruption by corporations, and pressures by IMF and World Bank to

push flawed partnerships without stakeholder consultation.

39. Business and industry agreed that the global sustainable development agenda should be complemented with type two initiatives that included clear timetables, were replicable and operated as mechanisms for delivery and implementation of type one outcomes. They mentioned the Southern African regional partnership and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) as good models for other partnership initiatives. The scientific and technological communities focused on knowledge and its potential for use and misuse in the evolution of partnerships. They emphasized the need to recognize the scientific and technological community as a unique stakeholder, and welcomed partnerships that were identified through participation, transparency, viability and respect for responsible democratic processes.

40. Farmers said holistic management required effective behaviour not imposed by regulations, and highlighted the need to encourage the multifunctional roles of farmers in biodiversity conservation, soil safeguarding and social development. They supported and expressed their willingness to contribute to research in biomass energy and other renewable energies to meet the needs of a changing climate, called for secure rights to land and genetic resources, and observed that supporting scientific research in agriculture meant addressing genetic modification and ratifying the Cartagena Protocol. They noted the unavoidable need for public-private partnerships in water use, and referred to the recommendations of the Bonn Conference on Freshwater.

41. The representative of the United States noted the need to set achievable targets prioritized through partnerships as a means to carry out action. He noted that type one commitments would not produce results on the ground, but type two partnerships would and should be seen as mechanisms for delivery. He envisioned self-reporting mechanisms for future partnerships that were transparent and indicated a willingness to work on partnerships in many areas, and noted a need for balance in defining partnerships without being too prescriptive. The EU stressed the need for a plan of action for implementation that reflected realistic type one outcomes, and advocated a focus on how to relate types one and two meaningfully. He supported calls for a gender perspective and the inclusion of indigenous people and youth in partnership initiatives, noted that local authorities were crucial and ownership of type two outcomes was essential, and identified farmers and scientific communities as multifaceted groups that had multiple roles. He supported follow-up mechanisms to ensure the legitimacy of partnerships, including dialogues that would continue to provide stakeholder input to the sustainable development process.

42. Saint Lucia referred to a global survey showing that 78 per cent of people worldwide were calling for a mechanism for corporate accountability. Noting that the Prime Minister had set up a special office to follow events around the partnerships in the Summit process, she noted that the credibility of the United Nations should be kept intact through the establishment of a framework for monitoring and suggested a code of conduct for transnational corporations should be linked to type one and two outcomes so that the latter did not become an independent "side event" at the Summit. China offered its support and expressed willingness to discuss corporate accountability in partnerships. Japan highlighted the role of local authorities in policy-making and the importance of the scientific and technological community in capacity-building, and proposed type two partnerships based on those priorities, including initiatives on satellite mapping, forests, biodiversity, freshwater and capacity-building for science and technology.

Dialogue

43. In the ensuing discussion, the Facilitator noted common concerns related to partnership initiatives, and asked the United States to respond to the question from women on how partnerships would avoid primarily benefiting multinational corporations. The United States noted that major groups included business and that that sector could be consistent with sustainable development principles. He said that the point of partnerships was to ensure sustainable development, and anyone entering into such an agreement would necessarily ensure that sustainable development principles were not violated.

44. Women responded that that answer did not address the harmful actions of multinational corporations. Indigenous people added that transnational corporations in the Arctic region were harming communities and the environment through natural resource exploitation, and underscored the need to protect against negative effects of globalization.

NGOs noted that the United States opposed regulation of transnational corporations and lacked ratification of global agreements, and wished the record to show that NGOs opposed intimidation and interference in the internal affairs of other nations in their efforts to have a viable discussion on partnerships. The United States responded that it had signed and/or ratified a number of multilateral environmental agreements and conventions, such as the conventions to combat desertification, on persistent organic pollutants and on straddling fishstocks, as well as the Montreal Protocol.

45. The Facilitator asked participants to return to the issue of linkages between type two partnerships and type one commitments. Farmers noted that type one outcomes involved rules that flowed to type two partnerships, and investment in partnerships in such areas as trade could create interdependence to stimulate better sustainable practices over time. The EU asked participants how linkages between types one and two could be recognized and fulfilled. Belgium noted confusion around what principles and frameworks should be attached to type two initiatives, stressed the need to ensure that initiatives were indeed addressing sustainable development and agreed that "United Nations approval" mandated a clear definition of type two outcomes.

46. NGOs recalled trade unions' comments on creating a relative balance of power, and urged Governments to take on that role in establishing criteria to achieve such a balance. Women and local authorities also noted that it must be transparent and involve indicators to ensure that ethical criteria were addressed. Trade unions offered the ILO code of conduct as a supportive framework in that context. Youth requested United Nations monitoring of type two outcomes, noting that self-regulation of partnerships would undermine standards, and suggested that Government participation be contingent on their ratification of conventions and multilateral environmental agreements.

47. South Africa expressed commitment to targets and time frames and providing a basis for type two partnerships. Denmark noted that operational type two outcomes needed principles and guidance on a common understanding of those outcomes, and agreed with indigenous people that local collaboration was essential for success. The scientific and technological communities stressed verifiable facts and outcomes as essential to type two initiatives. Local authorities felt that local governments should be integrated in type one outcomes.

48. NGOs, trade unions, youth, women and indigenous people questioned what the impacts or results of that dialogue would be and how the principles identified would be taken into account, especially given possible weak language on human rights and corporate responsibility in the plan of action for implementation. They expressed lack of confidence over whether partnerships could be successfully forged in good faith, and uncertainty about how to ensure that partners would not be exploited. Farmers also emphasized ethics in partnerships. Business and industry underscored that partnerships were inherently "local", with good governance as a prerequisite.

49. Co-Chair Kára noted that the dialogue process was cumulative and could involve opportunities to return to discussions on those issues if major groups agreed on such a strategy. Co-Chair Quarless recognized that partnerships were not new, and clarified that the United Nations was using the opportunity of the Summit to galvanize, focus and concentrate the energy that existed in partnerships to mobilize action for sustainable development implementation. The Summit Secretary-General sought to allay fears that type two initiatives could serve as a substitute for effective type one commitments from Governments, noting that type two partnerships were designed to bring public institutions into the sustainable development implementation process. He observed that none of the type two partnership initiatives that had already been submitted for consideration by the Summit included corporations, noted that details of those initiatives were available on the Summit web site, and encouraged major groups and Governments to consider participating.

50. Major groups discussed and identified common principles for type two partnerships. All major groups emphasized that type two outcomes should not serve as substitutes for type one commitments, and stressed that strong commitments by Governments to binding international agreements and ratification of United Nations conventions on sustainable development issues should be prerequisites for effective voluntary partnerships. Many suggested that partnerships must necessarily contain the following elements:

- Credible, measurable objectives and milestones;
- Assessment criteria or indicators;

- Reporting, monitoring and verification using mechanisms at the United Nations level, involving both Governments and major groups;
- Financing mechanism;
- Gender-specific tools and data.

51. Most major groups felt that type two partnerships should be based on critical elements, such as:

- Equality (intergenerational, gender, racial, social and economic);
- Justice (social, environmental and economic);
- Transparency, openness, good faith and accountability among partners;
- Transferability and replicability;
- Ownership through consultation and full participation from an early stage, and the right to reject inappropriate partnerships;
- The precautionary principle and the polluter pays principle;
- An integrated approach to sustainable development;
- Self-determination and recognition of human rights;
- Equal access to necessary resources;
- Respect for data and facts.

52. In the afternoon, the dialogue turned to the topic of means and mechanisms for monitoring and follow-up to type two partnerships. Trade unions highlighted the importance of knowledge early in the process of creating new roles and programmes. Local authorities, supported by Canada, emphasized emerging city-to-city cooperation, and proposed the establishment of a framework for supporting local environmental initiatives. The scientific and technological communities expressed commitment to partnerships regardless of United Nations endorsement. NGOs noted cases of partnerships that had broken due to conflicting needs and exclusion of local communities.

53. Business and industry noted that partnerships constituted voluntary agreements between groups of people who might not be equal in terms of resources, and suggested that partnerships could focus on issues critical to sustainable development, such as sanitation, which could be easily agreed by all stakeholders. Women also highlighted power imbalances and asked whether the United Nations could provide mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation. Youth endorsed mechanisms for accountability and approval based on criteria showing that the partnership made a unique contribution to sustainable development, adhered to Millennium Declaration goals, was endorsed by the United Nations and incorporated clear time frames for implementation and compulsory guidelines for monitoring.

54. Japan supported concrete and outcome-oriented initiatives driven by self-regulation and monitored and evaluated by all involved, and welcomed participation by women. France highlighted mechanisms for financing public-private partnership initiatives on a variety of issues. Guyana added that resource flows must be allowed to develop and mature, to create capacity through collective determination based in equal partnerships. Business and industry supported local involvement requiring decentralized power structures, participatory planning and shared resources, and involving participatory monitoring systems. The EU added that a follow-up mechanism should be given fundamental importance, and supported establishment of strategies beyond the regional level that could share best practices on initiatives.

55. The Facilitator noted that a global framework must distinguish among partnerships at the local, regional, national and international levels. The Russian Federation highlighted experience with regional partnerships, involving a new conception of regional ecological centres. The scientific and technological communities noted that local and regional level partnerships should involve an overview of how to handle complex global systems. Business and industry noted the success of microcredit and microfinance for women around the world as a good example of cooperation that could be scaled up, and expressed disappointment that the Chair's text on poverty eradication lacked meaningful references to such activities.

56. Ethiopia underscored farmers' concerns about preserving genetic diversity, and farmers corroborated that view, citing examples of conflicts with pesticide and fertilizer manufacturers. NGOs with a focus on agro-biodiversity criticized partnerships initiated by biotechnology companies and Governments, which used communities to make unsustainable partnerships seem credible. Indigenous people and youth asked

Governments to describe mechanisms that could ensure sustainable development in communities, protect those without power and monitor without bias. Bangladesh noted increased field-testing of GMO products in developing countries in the name of research, without mechanisms to protect local communities. The scientific and technological communities noted that horizontal gene transfer was common in nature and could now produce medicines and vaccines, and supported further exploring those possibilities.

57. Women called for gender mainstreaming and gender justice mechanisms, and wished to ensure that partnerships abided by established United Nations conventions. The Republic of Korea noted incorporation of gender issues at the ministerial level and NGO participation in decision-making. New Zealand expressed interest in a process that could draw on the experience of major groups in defining new partnerships and policies related to gender issues. Switzerland said partnerships should reinforce type one outcomes and support good governance. Belgium, supported by youth, cautioned against placing too many or too few responsibilities on the private sector or on social groups, endorsed the scientific and technological communities on North-South partnerships for poverty eradication and development goals for changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production. Indonesia highlighted costs, and farmers stressed the need for empowerment in their decision-making.

58. NGOs expressed appreciation for Saint Lucia's position on the need for corporate codes of conduct, reiterated concerns on addressing the negative consequences of globalization and withheld consensus on any support for partnerships. Indigenous people agreed that concrete suggestions on how to develop mechanisms for successful partnerships and how to ensure their sustainability should be further developed, especially when responsibilities might shift. They questioned how sustainable development could be ensured if States were not willing to recognize indigenous peoples' rights.

59. The Facilitator challenged Governments to articulate their concerns and address what Governments might need from major groups for action on type two partnerships. The Netherlands inquired by what mechanism business was developing partnership initiatives, and whether related monitoring and reporting would be done on a group or individual level. Finland noted that new partnerships needed countries in the South to come forward with initiatives, and asked if initiatives should aim for the international level. Kazakhstan supported partnerships based on a regional or ecosystem approach rather than a common political approach. Guyana said smaller economies must have partnerships based on well-defined protocols.

60. The EU asked for information on how to contact major groups at the meeting so that communication could be established. Japan supported focal points for partnerships in responsible information-sharing, and emphasized that scientific and technological communities were necessary in overcoming knowledge barriers. The United States supported the need for initiatives to provide more information on Earth systems, and a representative of the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites reported on successful international efforts in the use of space technology to provide satellite data for producers and consumers. The scientific and technological communities reiterated their role as a service provider for the future.

61. Business and industry responded to a question by farmers, noting that business and industry could act as a catalyst but could not act alone. Trade unions questioned financing for partnerships, expressing concern that stakeholders guided investment proposals and held government budgetary processes accountable, and noted that priorities should be linked to policies on international taxation and financial instruments. Youth supported partnerships on the precondition that the prerequisites they proposed would become part of the framework for partnerships, and to the extent that their proposals on education, capacity-building, production and consumption and inclusion of youth in governance processes would be heard and considered. Women emphasized the importance of guarantees from all sectors, including the United Nations and Governments, for gender assessments and gender mainstreaming.

62. Indigenous people spoke in memory of ancestors who sat at the negotiating table 40 years ago, noting that the call to change unsustainable ways of life had yet to be heeded. They noted that the world was at a crossroads and at a dangerous point in evolution and that indigenous people would continue to participate in dialogues, and called for the United Nations Decade of Indigenous Peoples to conclude with a world conference on indigenous peoples. NGOs noted that

they had hoped for Governments to succeed in taking revolutionary steps toward type one outcomes, and in failing that appeared to be relying on type two initiatives to add credibility to a repressive process. On the principle of not wanting type two initiatives to become trivial pursuits, NGOs rejected voluntary initiatives on type two outcomes, and urged Governments to do their jobs.

63. From the discussion, major groups suggested a number of measures and mechanisms as potential elements of a global framework of partnerships, including:

- The creation of an international convention on corporate accountability;
- Codes of conduct, including a gender audit;
- Participatory monitoring mechanisms at the multilateral level, with clear time frames and milestones;
- Financial resources;
- Education and other capacity-building components;
- Registration database of partnership initiatives;
- A clear selection mechanism;
- A collective multi-stakeholder review mechanism for monitoring and evaluation;
- Early and bottom-up involvement of all stakeholders;
- Involvement of stakeholders even if no legal recourse against a partnership existed;
- Local involvement and implementation;
- Based on scientific facts and knowledge, which should be generated where missing;
- The possibility that partnerships could take the form of legally binding agreements.

Closing plenary
Reports from the discussion groups and future priorities

Report of Discussion Group I

64. Co-Chairs Ballhorn and Akasaka summarized the previous day's dialogue on capacity-building for sustainable development, and noted that major groups remain a rich source of constructive ideas, providing valuable input to the process. They also thanked the facilitators and indicated their appreciation for the use of Facilitators for the first time in the Commission on Sustainable Development process.

65. In comments invited by the Chair to the Co-Chairs' summaries, women underlined that sustainable development should provide an overarching framework for governance, emphasized gender mainstreaming within the United Nations family and gender justice at all levels, and called for a binding United Nations convention on corporate accountability as well as ratification of existing agreements. Youth and farmers emphasized actions at the community level, and proposed the creation of a global advisory council to monitor the partnership initiatives.

66. Indigenous people expressed their willingness to maintain a high level of participation in the process, and stressed the need for an international mechanism to recognize the indigenous peoples' right to land as fundamental to poverty eradication. NGOs highlighted the need to bridge gaps between formal and informal sectors in terms of job creation and the provision of services, and proposed a regulatory framework to provide for NGO legitimacy at the national level and support their role in delivering sustainable development.

67. Local authorities emphasized their role as providers of basic public services and highlighted the need for strong legal frameworks for public procurement, good governance at the local level and knowledge in capacity-building. Trade unions reiterated the need to strengthen governance institutions and pursue links between workplace and community, and highlighted the central role of job creation in poverty eradication.

68. The scientific and technological communities advocated human resource development, science education and institutional capacity-building to address the North-South divide. Farmers proposed establishment of networks for public service that are transparent and effective, stressed access to resources and supported the precautionary principle as a tool to increase responsibility for sustainable development. Business and industry noted that local business action was an engine for sustainable development and invited other groups' support for implementation. They agreed

that good governance at the local level was essential but would need clear guidance from the national level.

Report of Discussion Group II

69. Co-Chairs Kára and Quarless summarized the dialogue on a major groups framework for partnership initiatives and noted the skill of the Facilitator in keeping the discussion focused. They also noted the concern of many major groups regarding the link between type one outcomes and type two initiatives.

70. In comments invited by the Chair to the Co-Chairs' summaries, women, youth, indigenous people and NGOs all stressed that country participation in type two partnerships should be contingent on agreement on type one outcomes; underscored that partnerships should take into account common but differentiated responsibilities; proposed indicators for measuring the success of partnership initiatives; emphasized the need for third-party monitoring of partnerships; expressed unwillingness to engage in partnership with transnational corporations; and called for a convention on corporate accountability. Youth and indigenous people also stressed inter-generational equity and the recognition of the rights of indigenous people in partnerships.

71. NGOs noted that while they were open to the concept of type two initiatives, they would register a vote of no confidence in type two initiatives without type one outcomes. They observed a crisis in the current process, which must be addressed before partnerships could move forward. The profound sense of dissatisfaction was expressed in an effort to place the responsibility back on Governments, and NGOs noted their willingness to engage in partnerships only if Governments provided a strong sense of commitment from their side.

72. Local authorities and indigenous people highlighted the need for equal status among the partners in any partnership. Trade unions stated that voluntary partnerships were not enough, and required a framework of basic services and targets established by government. They agreed with women, youth and NGOs on the right to say no to partnerships. They warned that partnerships could be seen as further privatization at the expense of poor, women and other vulnerable groups.

73. Business and industry noted that partnerships were only means to deliver results, and supported the view that partnerships should have measurable performance goals and be replicable. They also questioned NGO reluctance about partnerships and reminded participants of many NGOs and other major groups that were already part of existing partnerships. Local authorities stressed that action by local governments offered a level of hope, especially in absence of government agreements on such issues as climate change. The scientific and technological communities emphasized the need for capacity-building to carry out the partnerships and the importance of knowledge and innovation in sustainable development efforts at all levels.

74. Farmers supported youth regarding the establishment of an independent multi-stakeholder agency, including Governments, to monitor partnerships. They agreed that the role of business was indispensable and that there was a need to build partnerships, particularly in the area of renewable energy. They expressed their readiness to enter into dynamic partnerships with business, science and technology and other groups that could provide solutions to biotechnology related problems.

75. Comments by Governments included those by Norway and the EU. Norway supported increasing the involvement of major groups in sustainable development, noted that concerns of NGOs need to be addressed, and agreed with youth on inter-generational equity, with women on participation, with local authorities on their role in sustainable development implementation and with indigenous people on the mobilization of political will. The EU stated that the multi-stakeholders dialogue had been of great interest and offered to follow the evolution of that process with attention to the views of major groups.

Future priorities: inputs to a political declaration

76. In closing statements, major groups were invited to express their future priorities as a way to make inputs in the political declaration to be adopted at Johannesburg. The inputs made are set out below.

77. Farmers prioritized public services as a precondition for rural sustainable development, as well as agricultural policies adapted to local situations that improved domestic production and the establishment of consultation frameworks for local projects. The scientific and technological communities stated that

implementation responsibility should rest with national Governments and the private sector but required international collaboration, and that institutional measures were needed to achieve the goals of the Millennium Declaration, and prioritized scientific advisory mechanisms, education and training.

78. Business and industry noted the need for sound governance frameworks and for an enabling environment to develop clear implementation mechanisms defined by type one outcomes. They suggested the use of the triple-bottom-line concept and building on existing global corporate reporting initiatives. Trade unions stated that the political declaration must mention employment promotion, accountability among Governments, promotion of public services and an ILO role in the social dimensions of globalization, and should also promote the ILO core labour standards.

79. Local authorities stated that the declaration should emphasize good governance at all levels and enable building the capacity of local authorities to promote and achieve the millennium development goals. They also highlighted effective decentralization, including fiscal local reform and the cancellation of unsustainable debt.

80. NGOs noted the fundamental contradiction between the vision of UNCED and the current economic and institutional policy trends, such as those within WTO that promoted liberalization and undermined national government efforts to shift to sustainable development implementation, especially in developing countries. They suggested that ecological debt and reparations be linked to debt cancellation, and that the political declaration of the Summit address racism and environmental justice in addition to reaffirming the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and reinvigorating the North-South partnership established at UNCED.

81. Indigenous people listed key priorities for the political declaration, including the reaffirmation of rights of indigenous peoples to land, water and resources; recognition and promotion of the right to self-determination, including prior informed consent and the right to say no to development projects; and the recognition of indigenous people as distinct peoples, with rights over traditional knowledge and biogenetic resources. Youth emphasized the negative trends since UNCED and demanded that Governments end wars, eradicate corruption, aim for economic and environmental justice, stabilize population growth, recognize the rights of refugee children, improve the gap on agreed ODA targets, re-evaluate trade agreements and recognize cultural and indigenous rights. They proposed a target of a 12 per cent increase in renewable energy by 2010, and proposed the recognition of the right to water as a human right.

82. Women supported indigenous people, NGOs and youth, and noted that major groups were not being heard as equal partners or treated with equal rights and respect. They felt that the process was at a crossroads and needed commitment to produce a strong outcome. For the political declaration, they proposed recognizing sustainable development as superior to current political-economic models; placing implementation efforts in the framework of human rights, gender and inter-generational justice; and setting time-bound targets for capacity-building. They also requested the ratification of regional and national human rights instruments, restitution for ecological debt, a convention on corporate accountability, and time-bound targets at the national level, including the goals of the Millennium Declaration.

83. Saudi Arabia made a statement that noted national activities addressing climate change, biodiversity and poverty strategies, and stated that UNEP should be strengthened in its roles and functions towards monitoring, assessment and capacity-building in developing countries. The ILO expressed appreciation for multi-stakeholders dialogues in providing a voice for the social pillar, and supported their continuation in the context of participatory decision-making.

Annex III

Vice-Chairpersons' summary of informal meetings on partnerships for sustainable development

1. During the fourth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, two informal meetings on partnerships for sustainable development were held (type two outcomes). The meetings provided participants a forum in which to exchange further views on the guiding principles for partnerships for sustainable development, which are intended to contribute to implementing Agenda 21, the goals of the United Nations Millennium Declaration and the intergovernmentally agreed outcomes of the Summit. They also gave interested parties an opportunity to discuss partnerships which they are undertaking. The informal meetings were attended by representatives of Governments, international organizations and major groups. Discussions showed a considerable interest in engaging in partnerships for sustainable development, and participants expressed the hope for wider participation, particularly by developing countries.

2. Based on the discussions during the first informal meeting, the Vice-Chairs circulated an explanatory note on guiding principles for partnerships for sustainable development. Participants welcomed the note as a useful basis for engaging in such partnerships. A slightly revised version, taking into account comments made during the second informal meeting, is contained in the appendix.

Observations on the guiding principles for partnerships for sustainable development

3. Participants asked for further elaboration of the guidelines for partnerships issued by the Vice-Chairs at the end of the third session of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee. They stressed that partnerships for sustainable development were not intended to substitute strong commitments by Governments in the intergovernmentally agreed outcomes of the Summit, but rather should reinforce the implementation of those commitments through concrete action.

4. Several participants expressed the view that partnerships for sustainable development should allow for a wider participation of stakeholders, involve them through a bottom-up approach and focus on the strengths and assets of each partner instead of being donor-driven. They would thus contribute to increasing the quality of implementation of Agenda 21. Other participants expressed concerns that those partnerships might lead to a shift in funding at the expense of existing programmes and projects, and stressed the need for partnerships to mobilize additional resources.

5. It was generally understood that partnerships for sustainable development were of a voluntary, self-organizing nature. The framework for their elaboration should therefore be flexible enough to allow for creativity and innovative ideas. On the other hand, there were strong calls to establish parameters for such partnerships that would ensure the integration of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development in their design and implementation, as well as monitoring of progress in their implementation after the Summit.

6. Participants highlighted the need for a multi-stakeholder approach, based on mutual respect and shared responsibility of all partners involved. Ownership of the partnership process and its outcomes should be shared among all partners, and all partners should be equally accountable. It was pointed out that capacity-building efforts should be undertaken to support potentially weaker partners.

7. The importance of getting the community level involved in the design and implementation of partnerships was stressed by several participants, since the successful implementation of sustainable development had to be achieved to a considerable extent at the local level. The impact of partnerships to be recognized by the Summit should, however, extend beyond the local and national levels; those partnerships should not replace existing bilateral channels of development cooperation.

8. There was agreement that the partnerships should ideally be elaborated as a genuine contribution to the outcome of the Summit and that in the case of ongoing initiatives and processes there would have to be a significant added value in the context of the Summit

for such partnerships to qualify for recognition by the Summit.

Potential areas for partnerships for sustainable development

9. Several participants reported on partnership proposals in a wide range of areas, including freshwater, energy, sustainable urbanization and sustainable agriculture. Other participants indicated that they needed more time to develop their ideas for partnerships for sustainable development and would welcome an opportunity to explore them with potential partners. Areas mentioned included chemicals, science, education and training, forests, information and communication technologies, sustainable mountain development, oceans and fisheries, sustainable consumption and production patterns, and technology transfer.

Follow-up process after the Summit

10. Participants agreed that the Commission on Sustainable Development should serve as the focal point for discussion of partnerships for sustainable development. They stressed that the Summit should not be the end-date for the submission of partnerships, and expressed the expectation that many more partnerships for sustainable development would be developed as part of the follow-up process. Some highlighted the need for a participatory approach in designing a mechanism for assessing progress in the implementation of partnerships. Others f that reporting requirements should be kept as simple as possible given the wide range in size and characteristics of partnerships. Several participants asked the Summit secretariat and the United Nations system to propose for consideration ways and means to support partnerships for sustainable development, including through the establishment of a clearing house mechanism, by giving quality guidance for partnerships and by helping to provide a regular assessment of ongoing partnership activities.

Information on the selection of partnerships to be recognized by the Summit

11. All interested partners were invited to submit their proposals for partnerships for sustainable development to the Summit secretariat (e-mail linnm@un.org), at the latest by mid-August 2002, using the form attached to the Chairman's explanatory note available at the official United Nations web site for the Summit (www.johannesburgsummit.org). Submissions will be posted to that web site. The Bureau of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee, with the assistance of the Summit secretariat, will review the information provided by the partners and determine whether the guiding principles for partnerships have been observed.

Appendix

Guiding principles for partnerships for sustainable development (type two outcomes) to be elaborated by interested parties in the context of the World Summit on Sustainable Development

Explanatory note by the Vice-Chairs Jan Kára and Diane Quarless

Background

1. In the context of preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the General Assembly, in its resolution 56/226, encourages global commitment and partnerships, especially between Governments of the North and the South, on the one hand, and between Governments and major groups on the other.

2. In its decision 2001/PC/3, paragraph 10, adopted at its organizational session, the Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee for the Summit states that Governments and major groups should exchange and publicly announce the specific commitments they have made for the next phase of work in the field of sustainable development. In the case of major groups, commitments and targets are expected to emerge from national, regional and international consultations of major group organizations. A record of the commitments announced and shared would be made and released as part of the Summit outcome.

3. Following up those recommendations, Vice-Chairs Jan Kára and Diane Quarless conducted a series of informal consultations during the third and fourth sessions of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee in order to exchange views on and find a common understanding for the scope and modalities of partnerships to be developed as part of the outcomes of the Summit (type two outcomes).

4. Based on those consultations, suggested guiding principles for partnerships, which should be adhered to in the design and implementation of all partnerships to be recognized as part of the Summit outcomes, are set out below.

Objective of partnerships

5. Partnerships for sustainable development are specific commitments by various partners intended to contribute to and reinforce the implementation of the outcomes of the intergovernmental negotiations of the Summit (draft programme of action and political declaration) and to help achieve the further implementation of Agenda 21 and the millennium development goals.

Voluntary nature/respect for fundamental principles and values

6. Partnerships are of a voluntary, "self-organizing" nature; they are based on mutual respect and shared responsibility of the partners involved, taking into account the principles of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and the values expressed in the United Nations Millennium Declaration.

Link with global agreed outcomes

7. Partnerships are to complement the intergovernmentally agreed outcomes of the Summit: they are not intended to substitute commitments by Governments. Rather, they should serve as mechanisms for the delivery of the globally agreed commitments by mobilizing the capacity for producing action on the ground. Partnerships should be anchored in the intergovernmentally agreed outcomes of the Summit (draft programme of action and political declaration) and should help to achieve the further implementation of Agenda 21 and the millennium development goals.

Integrated approach to sustainable development

8. Partnerships should integrate the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development in their design and implementation. They should be consistent, where applicable, with sustainable development strategies and poverty reduction strategies of the countries, regions and communities where their implementation takes place.

Multi-stakeholder approach

9. Partnerships should have a multi-stakeholder approach and preferably involve a range of significant actors in a given area of work. They can be arranged among any combination of partners, including Governments, regional groups, local authorities, non-governmental actors, international institutions and private-sector partners. All partners should be involved in the development of a partnership from an early stage so that it is genuinely participatory in approach. Yet, as partnerships evolve, there should be an opportunity for additional partners to join on an equal basis.

Transparency and accountability

10. Partnerships should be developed and implemented in an open and transparent manner and in good faith, so that ownership of the partnership process and its outcomes is shared among all partners and all partners are equally accountable. They should specify arrangements to monitor and review their performance against the objectives and targets they set and report in regular intervals (self-reporting). Those reports should be made accessible to the public.

Tangible results

11. Each partnership should define its intended outcome and benefits. Partnerships should have clear objectives and set specific measurable targets and time frames for their achievement. All partners should explicitly commit to their role in achieving the aims and objectives of the partnerships.

Funding arrangements

12. Available and/or expected sources of funding should be identified. At least the initial funding should be assured at the time of the Summit if the partnership is to be recognized there.

New/value added partnerships

13. Ideally, partnerships for sustainable development should be "new", i.e., developed within the framework of the Summit process. In case of ongoing partnerships, there must be a significant added value to those partnerships in the context of the Summit (more partners taken on board, replicating an initiative or extending it to another geographical region, increasing financial resources, etc.).

Local involvement and international impact

14. Although the active involvement of local communities in the design and implementation of partnerships is strongly encouraged (bottom-up approach), partnerships should be international in their impact, which means that their impact should extend beyond the national level (global, regional and/or subregional).

Follow-up process

15. Partnerships should keep the Commission on Sustainable Development informed about their activities and progress in achieving their targets. The Commission should serve as a focal point for discussion of partnerships that promote sustainable development, including sharing lessons learned, progress made and best practices.

16. Opportunities to develop partnerships for sustainable development will continue after the Summit. Submissions of partnerships after the Summit will be considered in the follow-up process.

Annex IV

List of documents before the Commission acting as the preparatory committee at its fourth session

Document symbol	*Agenda item*	*Title or description*
A/CONF.199/PC/15	1	Provisional agenda
A/CONF.199/PC/15/Add.1/Rev.1	1	Proposed organization of work
A/CONF.199/PC/16	2	Letter dated 18 March 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Niger to the United Nations addressed to the Chairman of the Commission acting as the preparatory committee
A/CONF.199/PC/17	2	Letter dated 5 April 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Mexico addressed to the Secretary-General
A/CONF.199/PC/18	4	Note by the Secretary-General on the multi-stakeholder dialogue segment
A/CONF.199/PC/18/Add.1	4	*Addendum*: dialogue paper by women
A/CONF.199/PC/18/Add.2	4	*Addendum*: dialogue paper by youth
A/CONF.199/PC/18/Add.3	4	*Addendum*: dialogue paper by indigenous peoples
A/CONF.199/PC/18/Add.4	4	*Addendum*: dialogue paper by non-governmental organizations
A/CONF.199/PC/18/Add.5	4	*Addendum*: dialogue paper by local authorities
A/CONF.199/PC/18/Add.6	4	*Addendum*: dialogue paper by trade unions
A/CONF.199/PC/18/Add.7	4	*Addendum*: dialogue paper by business and industry
A/CONF.199/PC/18/Add.8	4	*Addendum*: dialogue paper by scientific and technological communities
A/CONF.199/PC/18/Add.9	4	*Addendum*: dialogue paper by farmers' organizations

Document symbol	*Agenda item*	*Title or description*
A/CONF.199/PC/19	1	Letter dated 14 May 2002 from the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General
A/CONF.199/PC/20	1	Note by the Secretary-General on the accreditation of non-governmental organizations and other major groups to the Summit
A/CONF.199/PC/21/Rev.1	1	Note by the Secretariat on the participation of intergovernmental organizations in the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory committee for the Summit
A/CONF.199/PC/22	2	Letter dated 24 May 2002 from the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General
A/CONF.199/PC/L.1/Rev.1	2	Note by the Secretariat transmitting the revised Chairman's paper
A/CONF.199/PC/L.3	-	Note by the Secretariat transmitting the Vice-Chairpersons' paper on an institutional framework for sustainable development
A/CONF.199/PC/L.4	1	Note by the Secretariat on the status of documentation
A/CONF.199/PC/L.5 and Add.1-5	2	Draft plan of implementation for the World Summit on Sustainable Development
A/CONF.199/PC/L.6	7	Draft report
A/CONF.199/PC/CRP.2	-	Note by the Secretariat transmitting the Hague Ministerial Declaration adopted by the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its sixth meeting
A/CONF.199/PC/CRP.3	-	Chairman's summary of the high-level segment
A/CONF.199/PC/CRP.3	4	Chairman's summary of the multi-stakeholder dialogue segment

Document symbol	*Agenda item*	*Title or description*
A/CONF.199/PC/INF.2	-	Information for participants
A/CONF.199/PC/INF.3/Rev.1	-	List of participants
A/CONF.199/PC/Misc.1	-	Note by the Secretariat transmitting the report of the Alliance of Small Island States interregional preparatory meeting for the Summit

02-45718 (E) 020802